

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on July 5, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 6, 15, 16 and 27 are amended, claims 35-39 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 40-41 are added; as a result, claims 1-34 and 40-41 are now pending in this application.

Affirmation of Election

Restriction to one of the following claims was required:

- I. Claims 1-34, drawn to query processing classified in class 707, subclass 3.
- II. Claims 35-39, drawn to generating database or data structure, classified in class 707, subclass 102.

As provisionally elected by Applicants representative, Albert C. Michalik, on June 9, 2006, Applicant elects to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-34.

The claims of the non-elected invention, claims 35-39 have been canceled. However, Applicant reserves the right to later file continuations or divisions having claims directed to the non-elected inventions.

Double Patenting Rejection

On page 3 of the non-Final Office Action of July 5, 2006, claims 1 and 16 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 17 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/607,812. Applicant is concurrently filing a terminal disclaimer with respect to U.S. Patent Application No. 10/607,812. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 16 be withdrawn.

Objection to the Specification

On page 5 of the non-Final Office Action, the specification was objected to allegedly because "computer 20" on page 12, line 17 should be changed to "computer 110". By this amendment, Applicant amended the paragraph including "computer 20", on page 12, line 17, of the specification, such that "computer 20" was changed to "computer 110". Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Objection to Claim 6

On page 6 of the non-Final Office Action, claim 6 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as allegedly being in improper form for not referring to a preceding claim. By this amendment, Applicant amended claim 6 to depend from claim 5. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 6 be withdrawn.

§101 Rejection of the Claims

On page 6 of the non-Final Office Action, claims 15 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant amended claims 15 and 26 to be directed to at least one computer-readable storage medium. Applicant submits that amended claims 15 and 26 are directed to statutory subject matter and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 15 and 26 be withdrawn.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

On page 7 of the non-Final Office Action, claims 1-11, 14-22, 25-30, and 32-34 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Eaton (U.S. Patent 6,570,567). Applicant submit that amended independent claims 1, 16 and 27 obviate the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method in a computer environment. The method includes, among other things, providing at least one query for taxonomy-related data with respect to Web services, wherein the taxonomy-related data corresponds to at least one node that is genealogically related to an origin node.

Eaton describes a system and method of displaying a pedigree chart (Abstract, lines 1-2). Eaton discloses displaying information with respect to an individual represented in a pedigree

chart (see Eaton, Fig. 12, and col. 4, lines 3-5). However, Eaton is completely devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of providing at least one query for taxonomy-related data with respect to Web services, wherein the taxonomy-related data corresponds to at least one node that is genealogically related to an origin node, as required by amended claim 1.

For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every feature of the claim. Applicants submit that, for at least the reasons discussed above, Eaton does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claim 1 and claims 2-11, 14 and 15, which depend from claim 1 either directly or as a base claim, be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 16 is directed to a method in a computing environment. The method includes, among other things, constructing a request for taxonomy data related to Web services, wherein the request includes data corresponding to an origin node within a taxonomy related to the Web services and data indicating that the request seeks data from one or more nodes that have a specified genealogical relationship with the origin node. Applicant submits that this feature is similar to the previously-discussed feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 16 and claims 17-22 and 25-26, which depend from claim 16 either directly or as a base claim, are not anticipated by Eaton for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 16, 17-22 and 25-26 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 27 is directed to a system in a computing environment. The system includes, among other things, a client including an application program that sends a request for taxonomy-related data with respect to Web services, wherein the request includes data corresponding to an origin node in a taxonomy and information indicating at least one genealogical relationship with the origin node. Applicant submits that this feature is similar to the previously-discussed feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 27 and claims 28-30 and 32-34, which depend from claim 27, are not anticipated by Eaton for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 27-30 and 32-34 be withdrawn.

'103 Rejection of the Claims

On page 14 of the non-Final Office Action, claims 12-13, 23-24 and 31 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Eaton (U.S. Patent 6,570,567) as applied to claims 1, 16, and 27 above, and further in view of Northrup et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0172127, hereinafter referred as Northrup). Applicant submits that amended independent claims 1, 16 and 27 obviate the rejection.

Claims 12 and 13, which depend from claim 1, are not anticipated by Eaton for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Northrup discloses using a UDDI server to provide information regarding a service provider (Northrup, paragraph [0021]). Northrup further discloses registering a process that provides a particular type of data, such as genealogy information (Northrup, paragraph [0563]). However, neither Eaton nor Northrup, disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination, providing at least one query for taxonomy-related data with respect to Web services, wherein the taxonomy-related data corresponds to at least one node that is genealogically related to an origin node, as required by independent claim 1, from which claims 12 and 13 depend.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that claims 12 and 13 are patentable over Eaton in view of Northrup and respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 12 and 13 be withdrawn.

Claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 16, either directly or as a base claim, and claim 31 depends from claim 27. Applicants submit that claims 16 and 27 are similar to claim 1. For at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 12 and 13, which depend from claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 23, 24 and 31 are patentable over Eaton in view of Northrup and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 23, 24 and 31 be withdrawn.

New Claims 40 and 41

New independent claim 40 and claim 41, which depends from claim 40, are directed to a method in a computing environment. The method includes, among other things, providing at least one query for taxonomy-related data with respect to a plurality of computing resources, wherein the taxonomy-related data corresponds to at least one node hierarchically related to an origin node. Applicant submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest providing at

least one query for taxonomy-related data with respect to a plurality of computing resources, wherein the taxonomy-related data corresponds to at least one node hierarchically related to an origin node.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (425-706-0362) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: January 4, 2007


By: /James T. Strom/

James T. Strom, Reg. No.: 48,702
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 706-0362
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

January 4, 2007
Date


Signature

Noemi Tovar
Printed Name